arXiv:1502.01839v1 [math.AP] 6 Feb 2015

Properties of ground states of attractive Gross-Pitaevskii equations with multi-well potentials*

Yujin Guo^{a},^{b}, Zhi-Qiang Wang^{c}, Xiaoyu Zeng^{a},^{b} and Huan-Song Zhou^{a},^{b}
^{a} *Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences,*
P.O. Box 71010, Wuhan 430071, P. R. China
^{b} *National Center for Mathematics and Interdisciplinary Sciences, Beijing 100190, P.R. China*
^{c}*Department of Mathematics, Utah State University, Logan, UT 84322, USA*

February 9, 2015

Abstract

We are interested in the attractive Gross-Pitaevskii (GP) equation in $\mathbb{R}^2$, where the external potential $V(x)$ vanishes on m disjoint bounded domains $\Omega_i \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ $(i = 1, 2, \cdots, m)$ and $V(x) \to \infty$ as $|x| \to \infty$, that is, the union of these Ω_i is the bottom of the potential well. By making some delicate estimates on the energy functional of the GP equation, we prove that when the interaction strength a approaches some critical value a^* the ground states concentrate and blow up at the center of the incircle of some Ω_j which has the largest inradius. Moreover, under some further conditions on $V(x)$ we show that the ground states of GP equations are unique and radially symmetric at leat for almost every $a \in (0, a^*)$.

Keywords: constrained variational problem; Gross-Pitaevskii equation; attractive interactions; ground states; multi-well potential.
MSC: 36J20, 35J60, 35Q40.

1 Introduction

In this paper, we consider the following stationary (i.e. time-independent) Gross-Pitaevskii (GP) equation in $\mathbb{R}^2$:

$$-\Delta u + V(x)u = \mu u + a|u|^2 u, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{1.1}$$

where $V(x)$ is the external potential, $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ is the chemical potential, $a > 0$ represents the attractive interaction strength. (1.1) is a model equation for the single-particle wave function in a Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC, in short).

It is well-known that equation (1.1) can be obtained from the time dependent GP equation when we look for the standing wave type solutions $\psi(x,t) = u(x)e^{-i\mu t}$, where

---

*Email: YJG:yjguo@wipm.ac.cn; ZQW:zhi-qiang.wang@usu.edu; XYZ:xyzeng@wipm.ac.cn; HSZ:hszhou@wipm.ac.cn; Tel:+86-2787199196

$i^2 = -1$. Moreover, (1.1) is also the Euler-Lagrange equation of the following constrained minimization problem

$$e(a) := \inf_{u \in \mathcal{M}} E_a(u)\,, \tag{1.2}$$

where $E_a(u)$ is the so-called GP functional [7, 25]

$$E_a(u) := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Big(|\nabla u|^2 + V(x)|u|^2\Big)dx - \frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 dx,\ \ u \in \mathcal{H}. \tag{1.3}$$

Here we define

$$\mathcal{H} := \Big\{u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) :\ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u(x)|^2 dx < \infty\Big\}, \tag{1.4}$$

and

$$\mathcal{M} = \Big\{u \in \mathcal{H};\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^2 dx = 1\Big\}\,. \tag{1.5}$$

Very recently, by assuming that

(V) $0 \le V(x) \in L^\infty_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, $\lim\limits_{|x|\to\infty} V(x) = \infty$,

the existence and non-existence of minimizers for (1.2) are proved in [2, 10], which show that there exists a critical value $a^* > 0$ such that (1.2) has at least one minimizer if $a \in [0, a^*)$, and (1.2) has no minimizers if $a \ge a^*$. Furthermore, the critical value $a^* = \|Q(x)\|_2^2$, that is, the square of the L^2-norm of the unique positive solution of the famous nonlinear scalar field equation

$$-\Delta u + u - u^3 = 0 \ \text{ in } \ \mathbb{R}^2, \ \ u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2), \tag{1.6}$$

see, e.g. [8, 19, 20, 22].

We mention that the above conclusions give a rigid mathematical explanation for the collapse of attractive BEC ($a > 0$), that is, if the particle number increases beyond a critical value a^* in an attractive BEC system, the collapse must occur, see [7, 13, 15], etc. In this paper, we aim to investigate the details of this collapse under certain general potentials. Roughly speaking, we analyze how a ground state, that is, a least energy solution of (1.1), blows up as $a \nearrow a^*$. So, we introduce now a rigorous definition of the ground states of (1.1). With μ fixed we first define the associated energy functional of equation (1.1) by

$$J_{a,\mu}(u) := \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Big(|\nabla u|^2 + \big(V(x) - \mu\big)|u|^2\Big)dx - \frac{a}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 dx, \ \ u \in \mathcal{H}. \tag{1.7}$$

Then, $u \in \mathcal{H} \setminus \{0\}$ is called a nontrivial (weak) solution of (1.1) if $\langle J'_{a,\mu}(u), \varphi\rangle = 0$ for any $\varphi \in \mathcal{H}$. Let

$$S_{a,\mu} := \big\{u(x) :\ u(x) \text{ is a nontrivial solution of (1.1)}\big\}, \tag{1.8}$$

and define

$$G_{a,\mu} := \big\{u(x) \in S_{a,\mu} :\ J_{a,\mu}(u) \le J_{a,\mu}(v) \text{ for all } v \in S_{a,\mu}\big\}. \tag{1.9}$$

Therefore, we say $u \in \mathcal{H}$ is a *ground state* (or, a *least energy solution*) of (1.1) if $u \in G_{a,\mu}$. As the least energy solutions are one sign solutions we will always assume a ground state is a positive solution. Now, a natural question is whether the minimizers of (1.2) are ground states of (1.1) and how about the converse? Our first theorem is to answer these questions. For any $a \in [0, a^*)$, let

$$\Lambda_a := \big\{ u_a : u_a \text{ is a minimizer of } e(a) \text{ in } (1.2) \big\}. \tag{1.10}$$

If $u_a \in \Lambda_a$, as illustrated in [10], we may assume that $u_a \geq 0$ and u_a satisfies (1.1) with a suitable $\mu = \mu_a$. By the results of [11] and the references therein, we known that $e(a)$ defined in (1.2) has a unique positive minimizer for any $a > 0$ being small enough $(a < a^*)$. So, we may define

$$a_* := \sup \big\{ l > 0 : \ e(a) \text{ has a unique positive minimizer for all } a \in [0, l) \big\}, \tag{1.11}$$

and $0 < a_* \leq a^*$. Our Theorem 1.1 shows that $\Lambda_a = G_{a,\mu_a}$ for some $\mu_a \in \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 1.1. *Let the condition* (V) *be satisfied. Then, for all* $a \in [0, a_*)$ *and for a.e.* $a \in [a_*, a^*)$*, all minimizers of* $e(a)$ *satisfy (1.1) with a fixed Lagrange multiplier* $\mu = \mu_a$ *and* $\Lambda_a = G_{a,\mu_a}$.

We remark that similar conclusions to Theorem 1.1 was also studied elsewhere for different types of problems, see for instance [6, Chapter 8]. Theorem 1.1 is proved in Section 2, where some fundamental properties of minimizers and the energy $e(a)$ are also addressed. It expects that the fact $\Lambda_a = G_{a,\mu_a}$ is useful for the further understanding of the minimizers for (1.2) as well as ground states of (1.1). Based on Theorem 1.1, we have the following result on the uniqueness of positive minimizers of (1.2) under some further condition of potential $V(x)$.

Corollary 1.1. *Suppose* $V(x)$ *satisfies condition* (V) *as well as*

$$V(x) = V(|x|) \quad \text{and} \quad V'(|x|) \geq 0 (\not\equiv 0). \tag{1.12}$$

Then, for all $a \in [0, a_*)$ *and a.e.* $a \in [a_*, a^*)$*,* $e(a)$ *has a unique positive minimizer which must be radially symmetric about the origin.*

In view of Theorem 1.1, we start to study the properties of the ground states for (1.1) by investigating those of the minimizers for (1.2). If $V(x)$ satisfies (V) and has finitely many isolated zero points, e.g. $V(x) = \prod_{i=1}^{n} |x - x_i|^{p_i}$ with $p_i > 0$ and $x_i \neq x_j$ for $i \neq j$, the detailed analysis for the concentration and symmetry breaking of the minimizers of (1.2) as $a \nearrow a^*$ was first studied in [10] based on some precise estimates of the GP energy $e(a)$. However, the methods used in [10] depend heavily on the potential $V(x)$ having a finite number of zeros $\{x_i \in \mathbb{R}^2 : i = 1, 2, \cdots, n\}$. Very recently, the results of [10] were extended to the case where

$$V(x) = (|x| - A)^2, \ A > 0 \text{ and } x \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{1.13}$$

see [11] for the details. Clearly, the above $V(x)$ has infinitely many zeros, that is, $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : |x| = A\}$, which has zero measure. Then, the way of [10] for getting the optimal energy estimates for the GP functional (1.3) does not work anymore. In [11], the authors provided a new approach for establishing the energy estimates under the potential (1.13). As a continuation of [10, 11], in the present paper we want to consider problem (1.2) for more general potential $V(x)$ which may not have an explicit expression like (1.13), etc. Particularly, we allow $V(x)$ vanishes on a set with nonzero measure. These new features on $V(x)$ cause some essential difficulties on the estimates of GP energy. If the condition (V) is slightly strengthened, we have the following general theorem on the concentration behavior of the minimizers of (1.2).

Theorem 1.2. *Let $u_a \geq 0$ be a nonnegative minimizer of (1.2) for $a \in (0, a^*)$. If $V(x)$ satisfies*

(V_1) *$V \in C^\alpha_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ with some $\alpha \in (0,1)$, and $\lim\limits_{|x|\to\infty} V(x) = \infty$ as well as $\inf\limits_{x\in\mathbb{R}^2} V(x) = 0$,*

then, for any sequence $\{a_k\}$ with $a_k \nearrow a^*$ as $k \to \infty$, there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $\{a_k\}$, of $\{a_k\}$ such that each u_{a_k} has a unique maximum point $\bar{z}_k$, which satisfies $\lim\limits_{k\to\infty} \bar{z}_k = x_0$ and $V(x_0) = 0$. Moreover, we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \varepsilon_k u_{a_k}\big(\varepsilon_k x + \bar{z}_k\big) = \frac{Q(x)}{\sqrt{a^*}} \quad \text{strongly in} \quad H^1(\mathbb{R}^2), \tag{1.14}$$

where $\varepsilon_k > 0$ is defined by and satisfies

$$\varepsilon_k := \Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_{a_k}|^2 dx\Big)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \to 0 \qquad \text{as} \quad k \to \infty\,.$$

We note that in Theorem 1.2, we could not give explicitly the convergent rates for ε_k and u_{a_k} as $k \to \infty$. When the potential $V(x)$ is either polynomial as in [10] or ring-shaped as in [11], there are some precise information on the zero points of $V(x)$, from which we can deduce the exact convergent rates of ε_k and u_{a_k}. However, the methods of [10, 11] seem to work at most for the case where the zero set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) = 0\}$ has zero measure. Now, we address the refined concentration results for the case where the zero set $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) = 0\}$ has a positive Lebesgue measure, such that $V(x)$ is a potential with multiple wells and the bottom of the wells have positive measure. Towards this purpose, we require some additional conditions on $V(x)$.

(V_2) $\bar{\Omega} = \big\{x \in \mathbb{R}^2; V(x) = 0\big\}$, where $\Omega = \bigcup\limits_{i=1}^{m} \Omega_i$ and $\Omega_1, \cdots, \Omega_m$ are disjoint bounded domains in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and $V(x) > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}^c := \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{\Omega}$.

Moreover, we denote

$$R := \max_{i=1,\cdots,m} R_i, \quad \text{where} \quad R_i := \max_{x\in\Omega_i} dist(x, \partial\Omega_i) > 0\,, \tag{1.15}$$

and

$$\Lambda := \big\{\Omega_i : R_i = R \text{ for some } i \in \{1, \cdots, m\}\big\}\,. \tag{1.16}$$

With the further information (V_2) on $V(x)$, we then have the following optimal energy estimates and refined concentration behavior of nonnegative minimizers of (1.2) as $a \nearrow a^*$.

Theorem 1.3. *Suppose $V(x)$ satisfies (V_1) and (V_2), then*

(i) *The GP energy $e(a)$ satisfies*

$$e(a) \approx \frac{1}{4R^2a^*}\big(|\ln(a^*-a)|\big)^2(a^*-a) \quad as \quad a \nearrow a^*\,, \tag{1.17}$$

where $f(a) \approx g(a)$ means that $f/g \to 1$ as $a \nearrow a^*$.

(ii) *For any sequence $\{a_k\}$ satisfying $a_k \nearrow a^*$ as $k \to \infty$, there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $\{a_k\}$, of $\{a_k\}$ such that each u_{a_k} has a unique maximum point $\bar{z}_k$, which satisfies $\lim\limits_{k\to\infty} \bar{z}_k = x_0 \in \Omega_{i_0}$ for some $\Omega_{i_0} \in \Lambda$ and*

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} dist(\bar{z}_k, \partial\Omega_{i_0}) = R_{i_0} = R\,. \tag{1.18}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{2R}{|\ln(a^*-a_k)|} u_{a_k}\Big(\bar{z}_k + \frac{2R}{|\ln(a^*-a_k)|}x\Big) = \frac{Q(x)}{\sqrt{a^*}} \text{ strongly in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{1.19}$$

Theorem 1.3 implies that the minimizers of $e(a)$ blow up at the most centered point of Ω as $a \nearrow a^*$. In this case, since the infimum of $V(x)$ attains in the whole domain of Ω, the existing methods of [10, 11] cannot be applied directly, and some different arguments are necessary for proving Theorem 1.3. Indeed, based on Theorem 1.2 the key point of proving Theorem 1.3 is to establish the optimal blow-up rate of u_{a_k} and a refined description of the unique maximum point $\bar{z}_k$. To achieve these aims, a new and suitable trial function is needed to establish the optimal upper bound for GP energy $e(a)$, see Lemma 4.1 for details. On the other hand, as stated in Lemma 4.2, a proper lower bound of the minimizers is also necessary in order to analyze the optimal energy bound of $e(a)$. By a delicate analysis, these results finally yield the optimal blow-up rate of u_{a_k} and a refined description of the unique maximum point $\bar{z}_k$. We also remark that the proof of Theorem 1.3 implies the following refined estimate

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_{a_k}|^2 dx \Big/ \Big(\frac{|\ln(a^*-a_k)|}{2R}\Big)^2 = 1, \tag{1.20}$$

see (4.37) for more details.

Furthermore, Theorem 1.3 also indicates that *symmetry breaking* occurs in the minimizers when the potential V is radially symmetric. For example, suppose that $V(x) = V(|x|)$ satisfies (V_1) and $V(x) > 0$ in $\bar{\Omega}^c := \mathbb{R}^2 \setminus \bar{\Omega}$, where

$$\Omega = \big\{0 < R_1 < |x| < R_2 : V(|x|) = 0\big\} \tag{1.21}$$

for positive constants R_1 and R_2. It then follows from Theorem 1.3 that all nonnegative minimizers of (1.2) can concentrate at any point on the circle $|x| = \frac{R_1+R_2}{2}$. This further implies that there exists an $\bar{a}$ satisfying $0 < \bar{a} < a^*$ such that for any $a \in [\bar{a}, a^*)$, the GP energy $e(a)$ has infinitely many different nonnegative minimizers. However, $e(a)$ has a unique nonnegative minimizer u_a for all $a \in [0, a_*)$, where $a_* > 0$ is given by (1.11), and by rotation u_a must be radially symmetric around the origin. In view of the above results, we have immediately the following corollary.

Corollary 1.2. *Suppose $V(x)$ satisfies (V_1) and (1.21). Then there exist two positive constants $\bar{a}$ and a_* satisfying $0 < a_* \le \bar{a} < a^*$ such that*

- *(i) If $a \in [0, a_*)$, $e(a)$ has a unique nonnegative minimizer which is radially symmetric about the origin.*
- *(ii) If $a \in [\bar{a}, a^*)$, $e(a)$ has infinitely many different nonnegative minimizers which are not radially symmetric about the origin.*

Finally, we mention that the symmetry breaking bifurcation of ground states for nonlinear Schrödinger or Gross-Pitaevskii equations has been studied extensively in the literature, see e.g. [1, 14, 17, 18]. Also, the concentration phenomena have also been studied elsewhere in different contexts, such as [5, 21, 24, 27, 28] and the references therein. However, our analysis is mainly involved with either the variational methods or the attractive case, which is different from those employed in the above mentioned papers.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we shall prove Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.1 as well as some other analytical properties of minimizers for (1.2). Section 3 is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1.2 on the concentration behavior of the minimizers of $e(a)$ under general potentials. In Section 4, for the multiple-well potentials we first establish optimal energy estimates of nonnegative minimizers as $a \nearrow a^*$, upon which we then complete the proof of Theorem 1.3 on the refined concentration behavior of nonnegative minimizers as $a \nearrow a^*$.

2 Uniqueness of the ground state of (1.1)

In this section, we first study some properties of the GP energy $e(a)$, upon which we give the proofs for Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.1. These imply that $\Lambda_a = G_{a,\mu_a}$ and the uniqueness of the ground states of (1.1).

Before going to the discussion of the properties on $e(a)$, let us recall some auxiliary results which are often used later. By Theorem B of [29], we have the following Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u(x)|^4 dx \le \frac{2}{\|Q\|_2^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u(x)|^2 dx \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u(x)|^2 dx, \quad u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)\,, \tag{2.1}$$

where the equality is achieved at $u(x) = Q(|x|)$ with $Q(|x|)$ being the unique (up to translations) radial positive solution of (1.6). Using (2.1) together with (1.6) we know that, see also [6, Lemma 8.1.2],

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla Q|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |Q|^2 dx = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |Q|^4 dx. \tag{2.2}$$

Moreover, it follows from Proposition 4.1 of [8] that $Q(x)$ satisfies

$$Q(x)\,,\ |\nabla Q(x)| = O(|x|^{-\frac{1}{2}} e^{-|x|}) \quad \text{as } |x| \to \infty. \tag{2.3}$$

The following compactness lemma was essentially proved in [26, Theorem XIII.67] or [3, Theorem 2.1], etc.

Lemma 2.1. *Let (V) be satisfied. Then, the embedding $\mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow L^q(\mathbb{R}^2)$ is compact for all $q \in [2, \infty)$.*

Now, we give our result on the smoothness of the GP energy $e(a)$ with respect to a.

Lemma 2.2. *Let condition (V) be satisfied. Then, for $a \in (0, a^*)$, the left and right derivatives of $e(a)$ always exist in $[0, a^*)$ and satisfy*

$$e'_-(a) = -\frac{\alpha_a}{2}, \quad e'_+(a) = -\frac{\gamma_a}{2},$$

where

$$\alpha_a := \inf\Big\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx : \, u_a \in \Lambda_a \Big\}, \quad \gamma_a := \sup\Big\{ \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx : \, u_a \in \Lambda_a \Big\}, \tag{2.4}$$

and Λ_a is given by (1.10).

Proof. Since $V(x)$ satisfies (V), by the definition of $e(a)$, one can derive that $e(a)$ is decreasing in $a \in [0, a^*)$ and satisfies

$$0 \le \inf_{x \in \mathbb{R}^2} V(x) \le e(a) \le e(0) = \mu_1 \text{ for all } a \in [0, a^*),$$

where (2.1) is used in the above inequality and μ_1 is the first eigenvalue of $-\Delta + V(x)$ in $\mathcal{H}$. Moreover, it follows from (2.1) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx \le \frac{2e(a)}{a^* - a} \le \frac{2\mu_1}{a^* - a} \quad \text{for} \quad a \in [0, a^*)\,. \tag{2.5}$$

For any $a_1, a_2 \in [0, a^*)$, we have

$$e(a_1) \ge e(a_2) + \frac{a_2 - a_1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_{a_1}|^4 dx, \quad \forall \ u_{a_1} \in \Lambda_{a_1}, \tag{2.6}$$

$$e(a_2) \ge e(a_1) + \frac{a_1 - a_2}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_{a_2}|^4 dx, \quad \forall \ u_{a_2} \in \Lambda_{a_2}, \tag{2.7}$$

and therefore $\lim_{a_2 \to a_1} e(a_2) = e(a_1)$. This implies that

$$e(a) \in C([0, a^*), \mathbb{R}^+). \tag{2.8}$$

Furthermore, it follows from (2.6) and (2.7) that

$$\frac{a_2 - a_1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_{a_1}|^4 dx \le e(a_1) - e(a_2) \le \frac{a_2 - a_1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_{a_2}|^4 dx. \tag{2.9}$$

Assume $0 < a_1 < a_2 < a^*$. It then follows from (2.9) that

$$-\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_{a_2}|^4 dx \le \frac{e(a_2) - e(a_1)}{a_2 - a_1} \le -\frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_{a_1}|^4 dx, \ \forall \ u_{a_i} \in \Lambda_{a_i}, \ i = 1, 2. \tag{2.10}$$

This implies that

$$-\inf_{u_{a_2} \in \Lambda_{a_2}} \frac{1}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_{a_2}|^4 dx \le \frac{e(a_2) - e(a_1)}{a_2 - a_1} \le -\frac{1}{2} \gamma_{a_1}. \tag{2.11}$$

In view of (2.5) and Lemma 2.1, there exists $\bar{u} \in \mathcal{H}$ such that for all $a_2 \searrow a_1$,

$$u_{a_2} \rightharpoonup \bar{u} \text{ weakly in } \mathcal{H} \text{ and } u_{a_2} \to \bar{u} \text{ strongly in } L^p(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ for all } p \in [2, \infty) \ .$$

It then follows from (2.8) that

$$e(a_1) = \lim_{a_2 \searrow a_1} e(a_2) = \lim_{a_2 \searrow a_1} E_{a_2}(u_{a_2}) \geq E_{a_1}(\bar{u}) \geq e(a_1),$$

which yields that for all $a_2 \searrow a_1$,

$$u_{a_2} \to \bar{u} \in \mathcal{H} \text{ and } \bar{u} \in \Lambda_{a_1}.$$

We thus obtain from (2.11) that

$$-\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\bar{u}|^4 dx \leq \liminf_{a_2 \searrow a_1} \frac{e(a_2) - e(a_1)}{a_2 - a_1} \leq \limsup_{a_2 \searrow a_1} \frac{e(a_2) - e(a_1)}{a_2 - a_1} \leq -\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{a_1}. \tag{2.12}$$

On the other hand, by (2.4) we always have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\bar{u}|^4 dx \leq \gamma_{a_1}.$$

Thus, all inequalities in (2.12) are indeed identities, from which we obtain

$$e'_+(a_1) = -\frac{1}{2}\gamma_{a_1}.$$

Similarly, if $a_2 < a_1 < a^*$, letting $a_2 \to a_1^-$ and repeating the above arguments, one can deduce that

$$e'_-(a_1) = -\frac{1}{2}\alpha_{a_1}.$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 2.2. □

Remark 2.1. *Lemma 2.2 implies that if* $e(a)$ *has a unique nonnegative minimizer, then* $e(a) \in C^1([0, a^*))$. *However, this is true generally for* $a \in [0, a_*)$, *where* $a_* > 0$ *is given by (1.11), in view of the possible multiplicity of nonnegative minimizers as a approaches to* a^*, *cf. [10, 11].*

Applying Lemma 2.2 and Remark 2.1, we now prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. From (2.9), we have

$$\begin{aligned} |e(a_2) - e(a_1)| &\leq \frac{1}{2}|a_2 - a_1| \max\Big\{\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_{a_2}|^4 dx, \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_{a_1}|^4 dx\Big\} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\max\{\gamma_{a_1}, \gamma_{a_2}\}|a_2 - a_1|, \text{ for all } a_1, a_2 \in [0, a^*), \end{aligned}$$

where γ_{a_i} $(i = 1, 2)$ is given by (2.4). This implies that $e(a)$ is locally Lipschitz continuous in $[0, a^*)$. It then follows from Rademacher's theorem that $e(a)$ is differentiable for a.e. $a \in [0, a^*)$. Moreover, by Lemma 2.2 and Remark 2.1 we see that

$$e'(a) \text{ exists for all } a \in [0, a_*) \text{ and a.e. } a \in [0, a^*), \text{ and } e'(a) = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 dx, \ \forall\ u \in \Lambda_a, \tag{2.13}$$

and thus all minimizers of $e(a)$ have the same $L^4(\mathbb{R}^2)$-norm. Taking each nonnegative function $u_a \in \Lambda_a$, where $a \in [0, a^*)$ such that $e'(a)$ satisfies (2.13), then u_a satisfies (1.1) for some Lagrange multiplier $\mu_a \in \mathbb{R}$. One can easily deduce from (1.1) and (2.13) that

$$\mu_a = e(a) - \frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx = e(a) + ae'(a). \tag{2.14}$$

This shows that μ_a depends only on a and is independent of the choice of u_a. Thus for any given $a \in [0, a_*)$ and a.e. $a \in [a_*, a^*)$, all minimizers of $e(a)$ satisfy equation (1.1) with the same Lagrange multiplier μ_a.

We next prove the relationship $\Lambda_a = G_{a,\mu_a}$ to finish the proof of Theorem 1.1. For any given $a \in [0, a^*)$, consider any $u_a \in \Lambda_a$ and $u \in G_{a,\mu_a}$. Since u satisfies (1.1) with $\mu = \mu_a$, we know that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Big[|\nabla u|^2 + \big(V(x) - \mu_a\big)|u|^2 \Big] dx = a \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 dx, \tag{2.15}$$

which, together with (1.7), implies that

$$J_{a,\mu_a}(u) = \frac{a}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 dx.$$

Similarly,

$$J_{a,\mu_a}(u_a) = \frac{a}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx. \tag{2.16}$$

Since $u \in G_{a,\mu_a}$, we have

$$J_{a,\mu_a}(u) = \frac{a}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 dx \le J_{a,\mu_a}(u_a) = \frac{a}{4} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx. \tag{2.17}$$

Let

$$\tilde{u} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\rho}} u \text{ with } \rho = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^2 dx,$$

so that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\tilde{u}|^2 dx = 1$. Noting that u_a is a minimizer of (1.2), we obtain that

$$E_a(\tilde{u}) \ge E_a(u_a).$$

Therefore,

$$J_{a,\mu_a}(\tilde{u}) = \frac{1}{2} E_a(\tilde{u}) - \frac{\mu_a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\tilde{u}|^2 dx \ge \frac{1}{2} E_a(u_a) - \frac{\mu_a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^2 dx = J_{a,\mu_a}(u_a). \tag{2.18}$$

Note from (2.15) that

$$\begin{aligned} J_{a,\mu_a}(\tilde{u}) &= \frac{1}{2\rho} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \Big[|\nabla u|^2 + \big(V(x) - \mu_a\big)|u|^2 \Big] dx - \frac{a}{4\rho^2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 dx \\ &= \frac{a}{4\rho} \Big(2 - \frac{1}{\rho} \Big) \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u|^4 dx. \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

It then follows from (2.16)-(2.19) that

$$\frac{a}{4}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|u|^4dx = J_{a,\mu_a}(u) \le J_{a,\mu_a}(u_a) \le J_{a,\mu_a}(\tilde{u}) = \frac{a}{4\rho}\Big(2-\frac{1}{\rho}\Big)\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|u|^4dx. \tag{2.20}$$

Since $a>0$ and $u\neq 0$, (2.20) implies that

$$1 \le \frac{1}{\rho}\Big(2-\frac{1}{\rho}\Big). \tag{2.21}$$

We thus obtain from (2.21) that $\rho = 1$, i.e., $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|u|^2dx = 1$. Moreover, (2.20) and (2.21) are identities, i.e.,

$$J_{a,\mu_a}(u) = J_{a,\mu_a}(u_a),\ E_a(u) = E_a(u_a).$$

This implies that $u \in \Lambda_a$ and $u_a \in G_{a,\mu_a}$, and the proof is complete. □

We finally address the proof of Corollary 1.1, which deals with the uniqueness of nonnegative minimizers for $V(x)$ satisfying (1.12).

Proof of Corollary 1.1. Recall from Theorem 1.1 in [11] that $e(a)$ admits a unique nonnegative minimizer u_a for all $0<a<a_*$, where $a_*>0$ is given by (1.11). Then by rotation we can deduce that u_a must be radially symmetric about the origin. We next need only to prove the results for a.e. $a\in[a_*,a^*)$ under the assumption (1.12).

Note from Theorem 1.1 that for a.e. $a\in[a_*,a^*)$, all minimizers of $e(a)$ satisfy the following Euler-Lagrange equation (2.22) with the same Lagrange multiplier $\mu_a\in\mathbb{R}$,

$$-\Delta u(x) + V(x)u(x) - \mu_a u(x) - au^3(x) = 0 \quad \text{in } \ \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{2.22}$$

Moreover, because $V(x)$ satisfies (1.12), it then follows again from Theorem 2 in [20] that u_a solving (2.22) must be radially symmetric about $0\in\mathbb{R}^2$, and $u_a'(r)<0$ in $r=|x|>0$. Further, applying Proposition 4.1 and Theorem 1.1 in [4] yields that positive radial solutions of (2.22) must be unique. We thus conclude that for a.e. $a\in[a_*,a^*)$, nonnegative minimizers of $e(a)$ must be unique and radially symmetric about $0\in\mathbb{R}^2$, and the proof is therefore complete. □

3 General results on the concentration behavior for $u_a\in\Lambda_a$

In this section we prove Theorem 1.2, which focusses on the concentration behavior of nonnegative minimizers for $e(a)$ as $a\nearrow a^*$ under general trapping potentials. Let u_a be a non-negative minimizer of (1.2). Then u_a satisfies the Euler-Lagrange equation

$$-\Delta u_a(x) + V(x)u_a(x) = \mu_a u_a(x) + au_a^3(x) \quad \text{in } \ \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mu_a\in\mathbb{R}$ is a suitable Lagrange multiplier. We first establish the following lemma.

Lemma 3.1. *Suppose $V(x)$ satisfies (V_1). Let $u_a\in\Lambda_a$ and let $\varepsilon_a>0$ be defined as*

$$\varepsilon_a^{-2} := \int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|\nabla u_a(x)|^2dx. \tag{3.2}$$

Then,

(i)
$$\varepsilon_a \to 0 \quad as \quad a \nearrow a^* . \tag{3.3}$$

(ii) *$u_a(x)$ has at least one local maximum point $\bar{z}_a$, and there exists $\eta > 0$ such that the normalized function*
$$\bar{w}_a(x) = \varepsilon_a u_a(\varepsilon_a x + \bar{z}_a) \tag{3.4}$$
satisfies
$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla \bar{w}_a|^2 dx = 1, \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\bar{w}_a|^4 dx \to \frac{2}{a^*} \quad as \quad a \nearrow a^*, \tag{3.5}$$
and
$$\liminf_{a \nearrow a^*} \int_{B_2(0)} |\bar{w}_a|^2 dx \geq \eta > 0. \tag{3.6}$$

(iii) *The local maximum point $\bar{z}_a$ of $u_a(x)$ satisfies*
$$\lim_{a \nearrow a^*} \operatorname{dist}(\bar{z}_a, \mathcal{A}) = 0, \tag{3.7}$$
where $\mathcal{A} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : V(x) = 0\}$ denotes the zero point set of $V(x)$.

Proof. (i). If (3.3) is false, then there exists a sequence $\{a_k\}$, where $a_k \nearrow a^*$ as $k \to \infty$, such that $\{u_{a_k}(x)\}$ is bounded uniformly in $\mathcal{H}$. By applying the compactness of Lemma 2.1, there exist a subsequence (still denoted by $\{a_k\}$) of $\{a_k\}$ and $u_0 \in \mathcal{H}$ such that
$$u_{a_k} \overset{k}{\rightharpoonup} u_0 \quad \text{weakly in } \mathcal{H} \quad \text{and} \quad u_{a_k} \xrightarrow{k} u_0 \quad \text{strongly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^2) .$$
Consequently,
$$0 = e(a^*) \leq E_{a^*}(u_0) \leq \lim_{k \to \infty} E_{a_k}(u_{a_k}) = \lim_{k \to \infty} e(a_k) = 0,$$
since Theorem 1 of [10], $e(a) \to 0$ as $a \nearrow a^*$. This then indicates that u_0 is a minimizer of $e(a^*)$, which is impossible since Theorem 1 of [10] shows that $e(a^*)$ cannot be attained. So, part **(i)** is proved.

(ii). Since $u_a \geq 0$ satisfies the equation (3.1) and $\lim_{|x| \to \infty} V(x) = +\infty$, for any fixed $a \in [0, a^*)$, one can use comparison principle as in [16] to deduce that u_a decays exponentially to zero at infinity, thus
$$u_a(x) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad |x| \to \infty.$$
This implies that each u_a has at least one local maximum point, which is denoted by $\bar{z}_a$. Let $\bar{w}_a$ be defined by (3.4), we have
$$0 \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_a(x)|^2 dx - \frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a(x)|^4 dx = \varepsilon_a^{-2} - \frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a(x)|^4 dx \leq e(a) \to 0 \ \text{ as } \ a \nearrow a^*.$$
We thus obtain from (3.3) that
$$\frac{a}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a(x)|^4 dx \cdot \varepsilon_a^2 \to 1 \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \tag{3.8}$$

Together with (3.2) and (3.4), we conclude from the above that (3.5) holds.

To complete the proof of (ii), it now remains to prove (3.6). We first claim that

$$\bar{w}_a^2(0) \geq \frac{1}{2a^*} \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \tag{3.9}$$

Indeed, by (3.1) we see that

$$\mu_a = e(a) - \frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |u_a|^4 dx.$$

It then follows from (3.3) and (3.8) that

$$\varepsilon_a^2 \mu_a \to -1 \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \tag{3.10}$$

Moreover, in view of (3.1), $\bar{w}_a(x)$ satisfies the elliptic equation

$$-\Delta \bar{w}_a(x) + \varepsilon_a^2 V(\varepsilon_a x + \bar{z}_a)\bar{w}_a(x) = \varepsilon_a^2 \mu_a \bar{w}_a(x) + a\bar{w}_a^3(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{3.11}$$

Since $\bar{w}_a(x)$ attains its local maximum at $x = 0$ and note that $V(x) \geq 0$, we thus obtain from (3.11) and (3.10) that

$$\bar{w}_a^2(0) \geq \frac{-\varepsilon_a^2 \mu_a}{a} \geq \frac{1}{2a^*} \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*,$$

i.e., (3.9) holds and the claim is proved.

Note from (3.10) and (3.11) that for $a \nearrow a^*$,

$$-\Delta \bar{w}_a - c(x)\bar{w}_a \leq 0 \ \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2, \ \text{ where } \ c(x) = a\bar{w}_a^2(x). \tag{3.12}$$

By applying De Giorgi-Nash-Moser theory to (3.12) (see [12, Theorem 4.1]), we then have

$$\max_{B_1(\xi)} \bar{w}_a \leq C\Big(\int_{B_2(\xi)} |\bar{w}_a|^2 dx\Big)^{\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{3.13}$$

where ξ is an arbitrary point in $\mathbb{R}^2$, and $C > 0$ depends only on the upper bound of $\|c(x)\|_{L^2(B_2(\xi))}$, i.e., the upper bound of $\|\bar{w}_a\|_{L^4(B_2(\xi))}$. Therefore, it then follows from (3.5) that $C > 0$ is bounded uniformly as $a \nearrow a^*$. Taking $\xi = 0$, we thus obtain from (3.9) and (3.13) that

$$\liminf_{a \nearrow a^*} \int_{B_2(0)} |\bar{w}_a|^2 dx \geq \frac{1}{2C^2 a^*} := \eta > 0,$$

and (3.6) is therefore established.

(iii). By the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (2.1) and Theorem 1 of [10], we have

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_a(x)|^2 dx \leq e(a) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \tag{3.14}$$

It then follows from (3.4) and (3.14) that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)|u_a(x)|^2 dx = \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\varepsilon_a x + \bar{z}_a)|\bar{w}_a(x)|^2 dx \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*. \tag{3.15}$$

On the contrary, suppose (3.7) is false. Then there exist a constant $\delta > 0$ and a subsequence $\{a_n\}$ with $a_n \nearrow a^*$ as $n \to \infty$ such that

$$\varepsilon_n := \varepsilon_{a_n} \overset{n}{\to} 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{n\to\infty} \operatorname{dist}(\bar{z}_{a_n}, \mathcal{A}) \geq \delta > 0.$$

Since $\lim\limits_{|x|\to\infty} V(x) = \infty$, we thus deduce that there exists $C_\delta > 0$ such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} V(\bar{z}_{a_n}) \geq 2C_\delta > 0.$$

Then, by Fatou's Lemma and (3.6), we derive that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(\varepsilon_n x + \bar{z}_{a_n})|\bar{w}_{a_n}(x)|^2 dx \geq \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} \lim_{n\to\infty} V(\varepsilon_n x + \bar{z}_{a_n})|\bar{w}_{a_n}(x)|^2 dx \geq C_\delta \eta,$$

which however contradicts (3.15). Therefore, (3.7) holds and the proof is complete. □

Proof of Theorem 1.2. For any given sequence $\{a_k\}$ with $a_k \nearrow a^*$ as $k \to \infty$, we denote

$$u_k(x) := u_{a_k}(x), \bar{w}_k := \bar{w}_{a_k} \geq 0, \text{ and } \varepsilon_k := \varepsilon_{a_k} > 0,$$

where ε_{a_k} is defined by (3.2) and satisfies $\varepsilon_{a_k} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Let $\bar{z}_k := \bar{z}_{a_k}$ be a local maximum point of $u_k(x)$. It yields from (3.7) and (3.5) that there exists a subsequence, still denoted by $\{a_k\}$, of $\{a_k\}$ such that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \bar{z}_k = x_0 \text{ and } V(x_0) = 0, \tag{3.16}$$

and

$$\bar{w}_k \overset{k}{\rightharpoonup} w_0 \geq 0 \text{ weakly in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$$

for some $w_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$. Moreover, $\bar{w}_k$ satisfies

$$-\Delta \bar{w}_k(x) + \varepsilon_k^2 V(\varepsilon_k x + \bar{z}_k)\bar{w}_k(x) = \mu_k \varepsilon_k^2 \bar{w}_k(x) + a_k \bar{w}_k^3(x) \text{ in } \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{3.17}$$

and note from (3.10) that $\mu_k \varepsilon_k^2 \to -1$ as $k \to \infty$. Thus, by taking the weak limit in (3.17), we obtain that $\bar{w}_0$ satisfies

$$-\Delta w(x) = -w(x) + a^* w^3(x) \quad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{3.18}$$

Furthermore, it follows from (3.6) that $\bar{w}_0 \not\equiv 0$, and thus $\bar{w}_0 > 0$ by the strong maximum principle. By a simple rescaling, the uniqueness (up to translations) of positive solutions for the nonlinear scalar field equation (1.6) implies that

$$\bar{w}_0(x) = \frac{1}{\|Q\|_2} Q(|x - y_0|) \quad \text{for some} \quad y_0 \in \mathbb{R}^2, \tag{3.19}$$

where $||\bar{w}_0||_2^2 = 1$. By the norm preservation we further conclude that

$$\bar{w}_k \overset{k}{\to} \bar{w}_0 \text{ strongly in } L^2(\mathbb{R}^2).$$

Together with the boundness of $\bar{w}_k$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)$, this implies that

$$\bar{w}_k \overset{k}{\to} \bar{w}_0 \text{ strongly in } L^p(\mathbb{R}^2) \text{ for any } 2 \le p < \infty.$$

Moreover, since $\bar{w}_k$ and $\bar{w}_0$ satisfy (3.17) and (3.18), respectively, a simple analysis shows that

$$\bar{w}_k \overset{k}{\to} \bar{w}_0 = \frac{1}{\|Q\|_2} Q(|x-y_0|) \text{ strongly in } H^1(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{3.20}$$

Since $V(x) \in C^{\alpha}(\mathbb{R}^2)$, one can deduce from (3.17) that $\bar{w}_k \in C^{2,\alpha_1}_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2)$ for some $\alpha_1 \in (0,1)$, which yields that

$$\bar{w}_k \overset{k}{\to} \bar{w}_0 \text{ in } C^2_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^2). \tag{3.21}$$

Since $x = 0$ is a critical (local maximum) point of $\bar{w}_k(x)$ for all $k > 0$, in view of (3.21) it is also a critical point of $\bar{w}_0$. We therefore conclude from the uniqueness (up to translations) of positive radial solutions for (1.6) that $\bar{w}_0$ is spherically symmetric about the origin, i.e. $y_0 = (0,0)$ in (3.20) and

$$\bar{w}_0(x) = \frac{1}{\|Q\|_2} Q(|x|)\,. \tag{3.22}$$

One can deduce from (3.17) that $\bar{w}_k \ge (\frac{1}{2a^*})^{\frac{1}{2}}$ at each local maximum point. Since $\bar{w}_k$ decays to zero uniformly in k as $|x| \to \infty$, all local maximum points of $\bar{w}_k$ stay in a finite ball in $\mathbb{R}^2$. It then follows from (3.21) and Lemma 4.2 in [23] that for large k, $\bar{w}_k$ has no critical points other than the origin. This gives the uniqueness of local maximum points for $\bar{w}_k(x)$, which therefore implies that $\bar{z}_k$ is the unique maximum point of u_k and $\bar{z}_k$ goes to a global minimum point of $V(x)$ as $k \to \infty$. Moreover, (1.14) is followed from (3.20) and (3.22). The proof of Theorem 1.2 is therefore complete. □

4 Concentration behavior under multiple-well potential

In this section we turn to proving Theorem 1.3, which gives more detailed concentration behavior for the nonnegative minimizers of $e(a)$ as $a \nearrow a^*$, provided that the potential satisfies (V_1) and (V_2), that is, multiple-well potential. Inspired by [10, 11], we start with establishing the following energy estimates of $e(a)$.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose $V(x)$ satisfies (V_1) and (V_2), then*

$$0 \le e(a) \le \frac{1+o(1)}{4R^2 a^*}(a^*-a)\big(|\ln(a^*-a)|\big)^2 \quad as \quad a \nearrow a^*\,. \tag{4.1}$$

Proof. Let $\varphi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be a nonnegative smooth cut-off function such that $\varphi(x) = 1$ if $|x| \le 1$ and $\varphi(x) = 0$ if $|x| \ge 2$. Choose $\Omega_i \in \Lambda$ and $x_0 \in \Omega_i$ for some $i \in \{1, \cdots, m\}$ such that

$$\operatorname{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega_i) = R_i = R\,, \tag{4.2}$$

where R and Λ are defined by (1.15) and (1.16), respectively.

Let

$$\phi(x)=A_{\tau R}\frac{\tau}{\|Q\|_2}\varphi\big(\frac{x-x_0}{R}\big)Q\big(\tau|x-x_0|\big)\ \text{for}\ \tau>0\,, \tag{4.3}$$

where $A_{\tau R}>0$ is chosen such that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}\phi^2dx=1$. By the exponential decay of Q in (2.3), we obtain that

$$1\leq A^2_{\tau R}\leq 1+Ce^{-2\tau R}\quad\text{as}\quad\tau\to\infty\,, \tag{4.4}$$

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|\nabla\phi|^2dx\leq\frac{A^2_{\tau R}\tau^2}{a^*}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|\nabla Q|^2dx+C\tau e^{-2\tau R}\quad\text{as}\quad\tau\to\infty\,, \tag{4.5}$$

and

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|\phi|^4dx\geq\frac{A^4_{\tau R}\tau^2}{a^{*2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|Q|^4dx-Ce^{-3\tau R}\quad\text{as}\quad\tau\to\infty\,. \tag{4.6}$$

Using the equality (2.2), we then derive from (4.4)-(4.6) that

$$\begin{aligned}&\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|\nabla\phi|^2dx-\frac{a}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|\phi|^4dx\\&\leq\frac{A^2_{\tau R}\tau^2}{a^*}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|\nabla Q|^2dx-\frac{A^2_{\tau R}a\tau^2}{2a^{*2}}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}Q^4dx+C\tau e^{-2\tau R}\\&=A^2_{\tau R}\frac{a^*-a}{a^*}\tau^2+C\tau e^{-2\tau R}\quad\text{as}\quad\tau\to\infty\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4.7}$$

On the other hand, since

$$V\big(\frac{x}{\tau}+x_0\big)\leq\sup_{y\in B_{2R}(x_0)}V(y)\qquad\text{for all }\tau>0\text{ and }x\in B_{2\tau R}(0)\,,$$

we deduce from (4.2) that

$$V\big(\frac{x}{\tau}+x_0\big)\equiv 0\qquad\text{for all }x\in B_{\tau R}(0)\,.$$

It then follows from the exponential decay of Q that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}V(x)\phi^2(x)dx&=\frac{A^2_{\tau R}}{\|Q\|_2^2}\int_{B_{2\tau R}(0)}V\big(\frac{x}{\tau}+x_0\big)\varphi^2\big(\frac{x}{\tau R}\big)Q^2(x)dx\\&\leq C\int_{B_{2\tau R}(0)\backslash B_{\tau R}(0)}|Q(x)|^2dx\leq Ce^{-2\tau R}\quad\text{as}\quad\tau\to\infty\,.\end{aligned}$$

Combining with (4.7), this implies that

$$0\leq E_a(\phi)\leq A^2_{\tau R}\frac{a^*-a}{a^*}\tau^2+C\tau e^{-2\tau R}\quad\text{as}\quad\tau\to\infty\,. \tag{4.8}$$

By setting $\tau=\frac{1}{2R}|\ln(a^*-a)|$, we then conclude from the above that

$$\begin{aligned}0\leq E_a(\phi)&\leq\frac{A^2_{\tau R}}{4R^2a^*}(a^*-a)\big(|\ln(a^*-a)|\big)^2+\frac{C}{2R}(a^*-a)|\ln(a^*-a)|\\&=\frac{1+o(1)}{4R^2a^*}(a^*-a)\big(|\ln(a^*-a)|\big)^2\quad\text{as}\quad a\nearrow a^*,\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

and the proof is therefore done. □

In order to derive the optimal energy estimates of $e(a)$ as $a\nearrow a^*$, we also need the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2. *Under the assumption* (V_1)*, suppose* $w_\varepsilon(x) \in \mathcal{H}$ *is a nonnegative solution of the following equation*

$$-\Delta w_\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 V(\varepsilon x + x_\varepsilon) w_\varepsilon = -\beta_\varepsilon^2 w_\varepsilon + a_\varepsilon w_\varepsilon^3 \quad in \quad \mathbb{R}^2,\ \varepsilon > 0\,, \tag{4.10}$$

where both $x_\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}^2$ *and* $a_\varepsilon \geq 0$ *are bounded uniformly as* $\varepsilon \to 0$*, and* w_ε *satisfies*

$$w_\varepsilon(x) \to w(x) > 0 \quad strongly\ in \quad H^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \quad and \quad \beta_\varepsilon \to \beta > 0 \quad as \quad \varepsilon \to 0\,. \tag{4.11}$$

Then for any $\sigma \in (0,1)$ *and* $\bar{R} > 0$*, there exist* $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\beta, \sigma, \bar{R}) > 0$ *and* $\bar{\mu} = \bar{\mu}(\beta, \sigma) > 0$ *such that for all* $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0)$*,*

$$w_\varepsilon(x) \geq \bar{\mu} e^{-(\beta+\sigma)|x|} \quad for \quad \rho(\beta,\sigma) \leq |x| \leq \frac{\bar{R}}{\varepsilon}\,, \tag{4.12}$$

where

$$\rho(\beta,\sigma) := \max\Big\{(\beta+\sigma)^{-1}\big(\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\big)^{-2}, \frac{\beta+\sigma}{\sigma(\beta+\frac{3}{4}\sigma)}\Big\}\,. \tag{4.13}$$

Proof. For any $\sigma > 0$ and $\bar{R} > 0$, denote $R_\varepsilon := \frac{2\bar{R}}{\varepsilon} > 0$. Since $V(x)$ satisfies (V_1) and $\{x_\varepsilon\}$ is bounded uniformly as $\varepsilon \to 0$, we have

$$\varepsilon^2 V(\varepsilon x + x_\varepsilon) \leq C\varepsilon^2 \quad \text{for} \quad x \in B_{R_\varepsilon+4}(0)\,.$$

In addition, since $w_\varepsilon \geq 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$ and $\beta_\varepsilon \to \beta > 0$ as $\varepsilon \to 0$, it then follows from (4.10) that there exists $\varepsilon_1 = \varepsilon_1(\beta, \sigma, \bar{R}) > 0$ such that for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$,

$$-\Delta w_\varepsilon(x) + \big(\beta + \frac{\sigma}{2}\big)^2 w_\varepsilon(x) \geq 0 \quad \text{in} \quad B_{R_\varepsilon+4}(0)\,. \tag{4.14}$$

By applying Theorem 8.18 in [9] and (4.11), we derive from the above that for any $p > 1$ and $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_1)$,

$$\inf_{B_1(\xi)} w_\varepsilon(x) \geq C\|w_\varepsilon\|_{L^p(B_2(\xi))} \geq \frac{C}{2}\|w\|_{L^p(B_2(\xi))} \quad \text{for all} \quad \xi \in B_{R_\varepsilon}(0)\,. \tag{4.15}$$

Moreover, we note from (4.13) that there exists $\varepsilon_2 = \varepsilon_2(\beta, \sigma, \bar{R}) > 0$ such that $\rho(\beta,\sigma) < \frac{R_\varepsilon}{2}$ for all $\varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_2)$, and thus by letting

$$\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\beta, \sigma, \bar{R}) := \min\{\varepsilon_1(\beta, \sigma, \bar{R}), \varepsilon_2(\beta, \sigma, \bar{R})\}, \tag{4.16}$$

it then follows from (4.15) that there exists a constant $C(\beta,\sigma) > 0$ such that

$$w_\varepsilon(x) \geq \frac{C}{2}\|w\|_{L^p(B_2(x))} \geq C(\beta,\sigma) > 0 \quad \text{for all } |x| = \rho(\beta,\sigma) \text{ and } \varepsilon \in (0, \varepsilon_0). \tag{4.17}$$

Let

$$U(x) = \mu e^{-\lambda|x|}, \tag{4.18}$$

where $0 < \mu \leq C(\beta,\sigma)$ and $\lambda > 0$ to be determined later. It is easy to check that

$$-\Delta U(x) + \lambda^2 U(x) = \frac{\lambda U(x)}{|x|} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2\,. \tag{4.19}$$

Let $\varphi(x) \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^2)$ be given by

$$\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} \exp\{\frac{1}{|x|^2-1}\} & |x| < 1, \\ 0 & |x| \geq 1\,, \end{cases} \tag{4.20}$$

and define

$$h_\varepsilon(x) := \varphi_{R_\varepsilon}(x)U(x) = \varphi(\frac{x}{R_\varepsilon})U(x)\,.$$

It follows from (4.18) and (4.19) that, for $x' = \frac{x}{R_\varepsilon}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta h_\varepsilon &= \varphi_{R_\varepsilon}(x)\Delta U + \frac{2}{R_\varepsilon}\nabla U \cdot \nabla_{x'}\varphi(\frac{x}{R_\varepsilon}) + \frac{U}{R_\varepsilon^2}\Delta_{x'}\varphi(\frac{x}{R_\varepsilon}) \\ &= \Big(\lambda^2 U(x) - \frac{\lambda U(x)}{|x|}\Big)\varphi_{R_\varepsilon}(x) - \frac{2\lambda U x \cdot \nabla_{x'}\varphi(\frac{x}{R_\varepsilon})}{R_\varepsilon |x|} + \frac{U}{R_\varepsilon^2}\Delta_{x'}\varphi(\frac{x}{R_\varepsilon}) \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2, \end{aligned}$$

i.e.,

$$-\Delta h_\varepsilon + \lambda^2 h_\varepsilon = \frac{\lambda h_\varepsilon}{|x|} + \frac{2\lambda U x \cdot \nabla_{x'}\varphi(\frac{x}{R_\varepsilon})}{R_\varepsilon |x|} - \frac{U}{R_\varepsilon^2}\Delta_{x'}\varphi(\frac{x}{R_\varepsilon}) \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{4.21}$$

By (4.20), we have, for $i = 1, 2$,

$$D_i\varphi(x) = \begin{cases} -\varphi(x)\frac{2x_i}{(|x|^2-1)^2} & |x| < 1, \\ 0 & |x| \geq 1\,. \end{cases} \tag{4.22}$$

Direct calculations show that

$$\Delta\varphi(x) = 4\varphi(x)\frac{|x|^4 + |x|^2 - 1}{(|x|^2-1)^4} \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^2. \tag{4.23}$$

It then follows from (4.22) and (4.23) that

$$\frac{2\lambda U x \cdot \nabla_{x'}\varphi(\frac{x}{R_\varepsilon})}{R_\varepsilon |x|} = -\frac{4\lambda h_\varepsilon(x) R_\varepsilon^2 |x|}{(|x|^2 - R_\varepsilon^2)^2}, \tag{4.24}$$

and

$$\frac{U}{R_\varepsilon^2}\Delta_{x'}\varphi(\frac{x}{R_\varepsilon}) = \frac{4h_\varepsilon(x)R_\varepsilon^2[|x|^4 + |x|^2R_\varepsilon^2 - R_\varepsilon^4]}{(|x|^2 - R_\varepsilon^2)^4}. \tag{4.25}$$

Putting (4.24) and (4.25) into (4.21), we then have

$$-\Delta h_\varepsilon(x) + \lambda^2 h_\varepsilon(x) = \frac{\lambda h_\varepsilon(x)}{|x|} - \frac{4h_\varepsilon(x)R_\varepsilon^2}{(|x|^2 - R_\varepsilon^2)^4}\Big(\lambda|x|(|x|^2 - R_\varepsilon^2)^2 + |x|^4 + R_\varepsilon^2|x|^2 - R_\varepsilon^4\Big) \tag{4.26}$$

in $\mathbb{R}^2$. Note that

$$|x|^4 + R_\varepsilon^2|x|^2 - R_\varepsilon^4 \geq 0, \quad \text{if} \quad \frac{-1+\sqrt{5}}{2}R_\varepsilon^2 \leq |x|^2 \leq R_\varepsilon^2\,,$$

and

$$\lambda|x|(|x|^2 - R_\varepsilon^2)^2 \geq R_\varepsilon^4, \quad \text{if} \quad \lambda^{-2}\big(\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\big)^{-4} \leq |x|^2 < \frac{-1+\sqrt{5}}{2}R_\varepsilon^2\,.$$

Therefore,

$$\lambda|x|(|x|^2-R_\varepsilon^2)^2+|x|^4+R_\varepsilon^2|x|^2-R_\varepsilon^4\geq 0,\quad \text{if}\quad \lambda^{-1}\big(\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\big)^{-2}\leq |x|\leq R_\varepsilon\,.$$

This estimate and (4.26) yield that

$$-\Delta h_\varepsilon(x)+\lambda^2 h_\varepsilon(x)\leq \frac{\lambda h_\varepsilon(x)}{|x|}\quad \text{for}\quad \lambda^{-1}\big(\frac{3-\sqrt{5}}{2}\big)^{-2}\leq |x|< R_\varepsilon\,.$$

Taking $\lambda=\beta+\sigma$, we then further derive from (4.13) that for all $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0)$ with ε_0 given by (4.16),

$$\begin{aligned}&-\Delta h_\varepsilon(x)+\big(\beta+\frac{\sigma}{2}\big)^2 h_\varepsilon(x)\\ \leq&\Big[\frac{\lambda}{|x|}-\sigma\big(\beta+\frac{3}{4}\sigma\big)\Big]h_\varepsilon(x)\leq 0\quad\text{for}\quad \rho(\beta,\sigma)\leq|x|<R_\varepsilon\,.\end{aligned}\tag{4.27}$$

Since $0<\mu<C(\beta,\sigma)$, where μ is as in (4.18), it then follows from (4.17) that $w_\varepsilon(x)\geq h_\varepsilon(x)$ at $|x|=\rho(\beta,\sigma)$. Moreover, $h_\varepsilon(x)\equiv 0\leq w_\varepsilon(x)$ at $|x|=R_\varepsilon$. We thus obtain from (4.14) and (4.27) that for all $\varepsilon\in(0,\varepsilon_0)$,

$$w_\varepsilon(x)\geq h_\varepsilon(x)=\varphi_{R_\varepsilon}(x)\mu e^{-(\beta+\sigma)|x|}\quad\text{for}\quad \rho(\beta,\sigma)\leq|x|<R_\varepsilon\,.$$

Since $\varphi_{R_\varepsilon}(x)\geq e^{-\frac{4}{3}}$ for $|x|\leq\frac{R_\varepsilon}{2}=\frac{\bar R}{\varepsilon}$, we conclude that

$$w_\varepsilon(x)\geq \mu e^{-\frac{4}{3}}e^{-(\beta+\sigma)|x|}\quad\text{for}\quad \rho(\beta,\sigma)\leq|x|\leq\frac{\bar R}{\varepsilon}\,,$$

and the proof is done. □

Following above lemmas and Theorem 1.2, we next complete the proof of Theorem 1.3.

Proof of Theorem 1.3. For any sequence $\{a_k\}$ with $a_k\nearrow a^*$ as $k\to\infty$, we still denote $u_k:=u_{a_k}$ a nonnegative minimizer of $e(a_k)$. It then follows from Theorem 1.2 that there exists a subsequence of $\{a_k\}$, still denoted by $\{a_k\}$, such that each u_k has a unique maximum point $\bar z_k$, which satisfies $\bar z_k\overset{k}{\to}x_0$ for some $x_0\in\bar\Omega$. Moreover, we have

$$\varepsilon_k:=\Big(\int_{\mathbb{R}^2}|\nabla u_{a_k}|^2dx\Big)^{-\frac{1}{2}}\to 0\quad\text{as}\ \ k\to\infty\,,$$

and

$$\bar w_k(x):=\varepsilon_k u_k\big(\varepsilon_k x+\bar z_k\big)\to\frac{Q(x)}{\sqrt{a^*}}\ \text{ strongly in }\ H^1(\mathbb{R}^2)\tag{4.28}$$

as $k\to\infty$. To complete the proof of Theorem 1.3, it thus remains to establish the estimates (1.17)-(1.19).

Since $x_0\in\bar\Omega$, without loss of generality we may assume that $x_0\in\bar\Omega_{i_0}$ for some $i_0\in\{1,\ldots,m\}$. We first claim that (1.18) holds. Indeed, since $\bar z_k\to x_0$ as $k\to\infty$, where $x_0\in\bar\Omega_{i_0}$, we always have

$$R_0:=\lim_{k\to\infty}\text{dist}(\bar z_k,\partial\Omega_{i_0})\leq R_{i_0}\leq R\,.\tag{4.29}$$

For any fixed $0 < \delta < \min\{\frac{R_{i_0}}{5}, \frac{d}{5}\}$, where $d > 0$ is defined by

$$d = \inf\big\{\mathrm{dist}(\Omega_i, \Omega_j);\ i \neq j \ \text{ and } \ i, j = 1, \cdots, m\big\}.$$

Since $\bar{z}_k \to x_0 \in \bar{\Omega}_{i_0}$ as $k \to \infty$, we obtain that $\bar{z}_k \in \Omega^\delta_{i_0}$ for large k and

$$\mathrm{dist}(x_0, \partial\Omega_{i_0}) = R_0\,, \tag{4.30}$$

where $\Omega^\delta_{i_0} := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \mathrm{dist}(x, \Omega_{i_0}) < \delta\}$. Choosing

$$r_1 = R_0 + 3\delta, \quad r_2 = R_0 + 4\delta\,,$$

it then follows from (4.30) that

$$\Big|\big(B_{r_2}(x_0) \setminus B_{r_1}(x_0)\big) \cap (\Omega^\delta)^c\Big| > 0\,.$$

Recalling that $\bar{z}_k \to x_0$ as $k \to \infty$, then for large $k > 0$,

$$\Big|\big(B_{r_2}(\bar{z}_k) \setminus B_{r_1}(\bar{z}_k)\big) \cap (\Omega^\delta)^c\Big| \geq \frac{1}{2}\Big|\big(B_{r_2}(x_0) \setminus B_{r_1}(x_0)\big) \cap (\Omega^\delta)^c\Big| > 0\,. \tag{4.31}$$

In view of (3.10) and $\bar{w}_k(x)$ satisfies (3.17) and (4.28), we can apply Lemma 4.2 with $\beta = 1$ to see that for any $\sigma \in (0, 1)$,

$$\bar{w}_k(x) \geq C(\sigma)e^{-(1+\sigma)|x|} \quad \text{in} \ \ B_{\frac{r_2}{\varepsilon_k}}(0) \setminus B_{\frac{r_1}{\varepsilon_k}}(0) \tag{4.32}$$

holds for large $k > 0$. Moreover, note that there exists $C = C(\delta) > 0$ such that

$$V(x) \geq C \quad \text{for} \quad x \in \big(B_{r_2}(\bar{z}_k) \setminus B_{r_1}(\bar{z}_k)\big) \cap (\Omega^\delta)^c\,. \tag{4.33}$$

We thus derive from (4.28) and (4.31)-(4.33) that

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)u_k^2dx &\geq C(\delta)\int_{\big(B_{r_2}(\bar{z}_k)\setminus B_{r_1}(\bar{z}_k)\big)\cap(\Omega^\delta)^c} u_k^2dx \\ &= C(\delta)\int_{\big(B_{\frac{r_2}{\varepsilon_k}}(0)\setminus B_{\frac{r_1}{\varepsilon_k}}(0)\big)\cap(\Omega^\delta_{\varepsilon_k})^c} \bar{w}_k^2dx \geq C(\delta, \sigma)e^{-2(1+\sigma)\frac{r_2}{\varepsilon_k}}\,,\end{aligned} \tag{4.34}$$

where $\Omega^\delta_{\varepsilon_k} = \{x \in \mathbb{R}^2 : \varepsilon_k x + \bar{z}_k \in \Omega^\delta\}$. It then follows from the Gagliardo-Nirenberg inequality (2.1) that

$$\begin{aligned}e(a_k) = E_{a_k}(u_k) &\geq \Big(1 - \frac{a_k}{a^*}\Big)\int_{\mathbb{R}^2} |\nabla u_k|^2dx + \int_{\mathbb{R}^2} V(x)u_k^2dx \\ &\geq \frac{a^* - a_k}{a^*\varepsilon_k^2} + Ce^{-2(1+\sigma)\frac{r_2}{\varepsilon_k}} \quad \text{as} \quad a_k \nearrow a^*\,.\end{aligned} \tag{4.35}$$

One can check that the function

$$f_\gamma(s) = \frac{a^* - a}{a^*}s^2 + Ce^{-\gamma s}, \quad \gamma > 0, \quad s \in (0, \infty)\,,$$

has a unique minimum point s_γ satisfying

$$s_\gamma = \frac{1}{\gamma}\big[|\ln(a^* - a)| - \ln|\ln(a^* - a)| + C(\gamma)\big] \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*.$$

Thus,

$$f_\gamma(s) \geq f_\gamma(s_\gamma) = \frac{1+o(1)}{a^*\gamma^2}(a^* - a)|\ln(a^* - a)|^2 \quad \text{as} \quad a \nearrow a^*.$$

This estimate and (4.35) imply that

$$e(a_k) \geq \frac{1+o(1)}{a^*[2(1+\sigma)r_2]^2}(a^* - a_k)\big|\ln(a^* - a_k)\big|^2 \quad \text{as} \quad a_k \nearrow a^*. \tag{4.36}$$

Using (4.1), we then have

$$(1+\sigma)r_2 = (1+\sigma)(R_0 + 4\delta) \geq R, \quad \text{for any} \quad \sigma \in (0,1) \quad \text{and} \quad 0 < \delta < \min\big\{\frac{R_{i_0}}{5}, \frac{d}{5}\big\}.$$

This yields that $R_0 \geq R$, and thus $R_0 = R_{i_0} = R$ by (4.29). We therefore conclude (1.18).

Moreover, by applying Lemma 4.1, (1.18) and (4.36), we obtain that (1.17) holds for the sequence $\{a_k\}$. Since the above argument can be carried out for any sequence $\{a\}$ satisfying $a \nearrow a^*$, we also conclude that (1.17) holds for all $a \nearrow a^*$.

We next show that

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_k\big|\ln(a^* - a_k)\big|}{2R} = 1 \tag{4.37}$$

holds (passing to a subsequence if necessary). In fact, if

$$0 \leq \liminf_{k\to\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_k\big|\ln(a^* - a_k)\big|}{2R} = \eta < 1,$$

we then have

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon_k} \geq \frac{|\ln(a^* - a_k)|}{2R\eta_0} \quad \text{as } k \to \infty, \quad \text{where } \eta_0 := \frac{1+\eta}{2} < 1.$$

We thus obtain from (4.35) that

$$e(a_k) \geq \frac{a^* - a_k}{a^*\varepsilon_k^2} \geq \frac{(a^* - a_k)\big|\ln(a^* - a_k)\big|^2}{a^*[2R\eta_0]^2} \text{ as } k \to \infty.$$

Applying Lemma 4.1 yields that $\eta_0 \geq 1$, a contradiction. Similarly, if

$$\limsup_{k\to\infty} \frac{\varepsilon_k\big|\ln(a^* - a_k)\big|}{2R} = \eta > 1,$$

then

$$\frac{1}{\varepsilon_k} \leq \frac{|\ln(a^* - a_k)|}{2R\eta_0} \quad \text{as } k \to \infty, \quad \text{where } \eta_0 := \frac{1+\eta}{2} > 1.$$

Since $\eta_0 > 1$, we are able to choose positive constants σ and δ small enough that

$$\frac{(1+\sigma)r_2}{\eta_0 R} = \frac{(1+\sigma)(R+4\delta)}{\eta_0 R} < 1 \,.$$

It then follows from (4.35) that

$$e(a_k) \geq Ce^{-2(1+\sigma)\frac{r_2}{\varepsilon_k}} \geq C(a^* - a_k)^{\frac{(1+\sigma)r_2}{R\eta_0}} \text{ as } k \to \infty,$$

which however contradicts Lemma 4.1. We therefore conclude that (4.37) holds.

It finally follows from (4.28) and (4.37) that, for $k \to \infty$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{2R}{|\ln(a^* - a_k)|} u_{a_k}\Big(\bar{z}_k + \frac{2R}{|\ln(a^* - a_k)|}x\Big) \\
&= \frac{2R}{\varepsilon_k |\ln(a^* - a_k)|} \cdot \varepsilon_k u_k\Big(\varepsilon_k \cdot \frac{2R}{\varepsilon_k |\ln(a^* - a_k)|}x + \bar{z}_k\Big) \\
&= \frac{2R}{\varepsilon_k |\ln(a^* - a_k)|} \bar{w}_k\Big(\frac{2R}{\varepsilon_k |\ln(a^* - a_k)|}x\Big) \to \frac{Q(x)}{\sqrt{a^*}} \quad \text{strongly in } \ H^1(\mathbb{R}^2),
\end{aligned}$$

i.e., (1.19) holds, and we therefore complete the proof of Theorem 1.3. □

Acknowledgements: This research was supported by NSFC grants 11322104, 11471331, 11271360 and 11271201.

References

[1] W. H. Aschbacher, J. Fröhlich, G. M. Graf, K. Schnee and M. Troyer, Symmetry breaking regime in the nonlinear Hartree equation, J. Math. Phys. **43** (2002), 3879–3891.

[2] W. Z. Bao and Y. Y. Cai, Mathematical theory and numerical methods for Bose-Einstein condensation, Kinetic and Related Models **6** (2013), 1–135.

[3] T. Bartsch amd Z.-Q. Wang, Existence and multiplicity results for some superlinear elliptic problems on R^N, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **20** (1995), 1725–1741.

[4] J. Byeon and Y. Oshita, Uniqueness of standing waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations, Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A **138** (2008), 975–987.

[5] J. Byeon and Z. Q. Wang, Standing waves with a critical frequency for nonlinear Schrödinger equations, Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **165** (2002), 295–316.

[6] T. Cazenave, *Semilinear Schrödinger Equations*, Courant Lecture Notes in Math. **10**, Courant Institute of Mathematical Science/AMS, New York, (2003).

[7] F. Dalfovo, S. Giorgini, L. P. Pitaevskii and S. Stringari, Theory of Bose-Einstein condensation in trapped gases, Rev. Modern Phys. **71** (1999), 463–512.

[8] B. Gidas, W. M. Ni and L. Nirenberg, Symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, Mathematical analysis and applications Part A, Adv. in Math. Suppl. Stud. Vol. **7** (1981), 369–402.

[9] D. Gilbarg and N. S. Trudinger, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations of Second Order*, Springer, (1997).

[10] Y. J. Guo and R. Seiringer, On the mass concentration for Bose-Einstein condensates with attractive interactions, Lett. Math. Phys. **104** (2014), 141–156.

[11] Y. J. Guo, X. Y. Zeng and H. S. Zhou, Energy estimates and symmetry breaking in attractive Bose-Einstein condensates with ring-shaped potentials, submitted (2014).

[12] Q. Han and F. H. Lin, *Elliptic Partial Differential Equations*, Courant Lecture Notes in Math. 1, Courant Institute of Mathematical Science/AMS, New York, 2011.

[13] C. Huepe, S. Metens, G. Dewel, P. Borckmans and M. E. Brachet, Decay rates in attractive Bose-Einstein condensates, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999), 1616–1619.

[14] R. K. Jackson and M. I. Weinstein, Geometric analysis of bifurcation and symmetry breaking in a Gross-Pitaevskii equation, J. Stat. Phys. **116** (2004), 881–905.

[15] Y. Kagan, A. E. Muryshev and G. V. Shlyapnikov, Collapse and Bose-Einstein condensation in a trapped Bose gas with nagative scattering length, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81** (1998), 933–937.

[16] O. Kavian and F. B. Weissler, Self-similar solutions of the pseudo-conformally invariant nonlinear Schrödinger equation, Michigan Math. J. **41** (1994), 151–173.

[17] E. W. Kirr, P. G. Kevrekidis and D. E. Pelinovsky, Symmetry-breaking bifurcation in the nonlinear Schrödinger equation with symmetric potentials, Comm. Math. Phys. **308** (2011), 795–844.

[18] E. W. Kirr, P. G. Kevrekidis, E. Shlizerman and M. I. Weinstein, Symmetry-breaking bifurcation in nonlinear Schrödinger/Gross-Pitaevskii equations, SIAM J. Math. Anal. **40** (2008), 566–604.

[19] M. K. Kwong, Uniqueness of positive solutions of $\Delta u - u + u^p = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N$, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **105** (1989), 243–266.

[20] Y. Li and W. M. Ni, Radial symmetry of positive solutions of nonlinear elliptic equations in $\mathbb{R}^n$, Comm. Partial Differential Equations **18** (1993), 1043–1054.

[21] G. Z. Lu and J. C. Wei, On nonlinear schrödinger equations with totally degenerate potentials, C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris. **326** (1998), 691–696.

[22] K. McLeod and J. Serrin, Uniqueness of positive radial solutions of $\Delta u + f(u) = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^n$, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **99** (1987), 115–145.

[23] W.-M. Ni and I. Takagi, On the shape of least-energy solutions to a semilinear Neumann problem, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **44** (1991), 819–851.

[24] W.-M. Ni and J. C. Wei, On the location and profile of spike-layer solutions to singularly perturbed semilinear Dirichlet problems, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **48** (1995), 731–768.

[25] L. P. Pitaevskii, Vortex lines in an imperfect Bose gas, Sov. Phys. JETP. **13** (1961), 451–454.

[26] M. Reed and B. Simon, *Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics. IV. Analysis of Operators*, Academic Press, New York-London, 1978.

[27] X. F. Wang, On concentration of positive bound states of nonlinear Schrödinger equations, Comm. Math. Phys. **153** (1993), 229–244.

[28] Z.-Q. Wang, Existence and symmetry of multi-bump solutions for nonlinear Schrdinger equations, J. Differential Equations **159** (1999), 102–137.

[29] M. I. Weinstein, Nonlinear Schrödinger equations and sharp interpolations estimates, Comm. Math. Phys. **87** (1983), 567–576.